



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,862	01/21/2005	Paulus Cornelis Neervoort	NL 020772	1298
24737 7590 03/16/2010 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
HOEL, MATTHEW D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/16/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/521,862	Applicant(s) NEERVOORT ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew D. Hoel	Art Unit 3714	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.

(2) Gregory Thorne, attorney.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
NF (09-21-2009).

Claims discussed:
1-17.

Prior art documents discussed:
Kagan (5,618,045 A); Sharma (6,287,200 B1); Meyers (6,674,995 B1); Lynch (6,561,809 B1); Sugimoto (6,626,756 B2).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Peter D. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714
/M. D. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714

Status of Application: pending

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Time: P.M.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner upon reviewing the case believed that the new dependent claims pertaining to determining the size and shape of the virtual playfield corresponding to the actual playfield were significant in light of Kagan and Sharma and the independent claims as a whole. The examiner believed that these limitations corresponding to the determined type of game being played put into independent form would be allowable and sum up what the claims as a whole are trying to do. The examiner believes that determining the size of the playfield is supported at parent application EP 02078012.8, 7:14-19. The other proposed limitations are supported by the current specification. Mr. Thorne suggested putting the relative orientations of the mobile devices as well as the relative locations of the mobile devices into the independent claim for discussion purposes; these limitations correspond to para. 117 of the specification 2005/0288100 A1. In para. 117, the tops of the modular units facing each other allow these players to be on one team; the bottoms of the modular units facing each other allow these players to be on a second team. The examiner has 112 considerations about this passage as it is unclear whether it is an electrical or wireless connection, which would determine if the orientation is a physical connection or merely whether or not the devices angularly face each other. Referring to Kagan, Fig. 1, these modular units are already facing each other, so they can presumably be on the same team. The IR detectors of Kagan will have a conical zone of sensitivity as evidenced by Thompson (5,517,201 A, 3:46-4:9). One team of players using Kagan's devices could face each other to line up in each others' IR sensitivity zones to form one team; another could do the same to form another team. The examiner believed that Kagan disclosed assigning players with the modular devices to separate teams, each team comprising two or more players, and that Sharma demonstrated the obviousness of playing a game, such as a virtual volleyball game with the players' virtual positions corresponding to their physical positions (Figs. 2, 3, & 5, and corresponding descriptions). Mr. Thorne may submit proposed amendments by e-mail for discussion purposes. No exact allowable claim language was agreed on..